UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,431	09/30/2003	Terry Hamer	29516/38347	6194

27466   7590   11/05/2008
RICHARD A. FAY & CO.
RICHARD ARMS FAY
543 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102-2912

EXAMINER
DAYE, CHELCIE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 September 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17,37-54,56-59,67,69,70,74-80 and 85* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17, 37-54, 56-59, 67, 69-70, 74-80, and 85* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is issued in response to applicant's RCE filed September 12, 2008.

2.   Claims 1-85 are presented. Claim 85 is added and claims 18-36, 55, 60-66, 68,

71-73, and 81-84 are cancelled.

3.   Claims 1-17, 37-54, 56-59, 67, 69-70, 74-80, and 85 are pending.

4.   Applicant's arguments filed September 12, 2008, have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

5.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

September 12, 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

In particular, newly added claim 85 recites "wherein the accept action indicates that the administrator does not want to monitor the change", however, independent claim 1 (upon which claim 85 depends) states "generate an event action…and to send a message including the event action to the administrator". It is unclear to the examiner why the message is being sent to the administrator when the event action is an "accept action" if an accept action indicates no monitoring of the change by the administrator. Should the system merely skip over the step of sending the message?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1-17,37-54,56-59,67,69-70, 74-80, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de l'Etraz (US Patent No. 6,324,541) filed June 5, 2000, in view of Cheah (US Patent No. 7,003,546) filed October 13, 1999.

Regarding Claims 1,37,54,and 67, de l'Etraz discloses a relationship management system, comprising:

a first database that stores a plurality of user collections, wherein each user collection is accessible by a user of the system and includes one or more

first contact files, each first contact file including contact data that is unique to a

particular one of the first contact files (Fig.1; columns 19-20, lines 38-67 and 1-

38, respectively, de l'Etraz)[1];

a second database that stores a firm collection, wherein each firm

collection is accessible by an administrator of the system, the firm collection

including a second contact file for each different first contact file included in the

plurality of user collections, each second contact file having at least a portion of

data in common with one of the first contact files (Fig.1; columns 20-21, lines 40-

67 and 1-55, respectively, de l'Etraz). However, de l'Etraz is silent with respect to

an administration routine stored in a memory and adapted to be executed on a

processor to detect a change made to the common data of one of the first

contact files within one or more of the plurality of user collections, to generate an

event action in response to detecting the change, the event action consisting of

an accept action, a review action, a submit action, or a follow-up action, and to

send a message including the event action to the administrator of the system; a

change management routine stored in the memory and adapted to be executed

on the processor to receive a response to the event action from the

administrator, and to process the response by one or more of approving,

rejecting, or following-up on the event action with a different owner having a user

collection that includes the common data; wherein approving the change prompts

---

[1] Examiner Notes: The separation of the user collections is accomplished by using an "OwnerId" identifier within the database. The use of the owner record identifier is used to not only separate (i.e., distinguish) the data but also separate the several users of the system (see column 11, lines 13-21 and Table 1B, de l'Etraz).

the relationship management system to make the change to the common data of

the corresponding second contact file within the firm collection and to make the

change to the common data of the remaining user collections. On the other hand,

Cheah discloses an administration routine stored in a memory and adapted to be

executed on a processor (column 29, lines 38-59, Cheah) to detect a change

made to the common data of one of the first contact files within one or more of

the plurality of user collections (column 2, lines 47-61; column 26, lines 42-44;

and column 29, lines 25-37, Cheah), to generate an event action in response to

detecting the change, the event action consisting of an accept action, a review

action, a submit action, or a follow-up action, and to send a message including

the event action to the administrator of the system (column 19, lines 35-43;

column 23, lines 30-64; column 25, lines 52-67; column 30, lines 43-64; and

column 32, lines 19-23, Cheah); a change management routine stored in the

memory and adapted to be executed on the processor to receive a response to

the event action from the administrator, and to process the response by one or

more of approving, rejecting, or following-up on the event action with a different

owner having a user collection that includes the common data (column 2, lines

47-61; column 18, lines 27-38; columns 18-19, lines 53-67 and 1-34,

respectively; column 30, lines 32-64; column 32, lines 33-40, Cheah); wherein

approving the change prompts the relationship management system to make the

change to the common data of the corresponding second contact file within the

firm collection and to make the change to the common data of the remaining user

collections (column 19, lines 39-46 and column 20, lines 11-18 and column 30, lines 43-64, Cheah). De l'Etraz and Cheah are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of storing, processing, and displaying contact information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Cheah's teachings into the de l'Etraz system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggested by Cheah at column 2, lines 47-61, in order to control the use of corporate and user information, by updating previous information, facilitating registration, and disabling certain users from further use. As a result, improving approaches to automatically distribute and update contact information.

Regarding Claims 2 and 38, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system further including a user collection change routine adapted to make a change to the common data of a contact file associated with the particular contact within a second one of the user collections based on the change made to the common data of the corresponding second contact file associated with the particular contact within the firm collection (column 9, lines 45-64, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 3,39,and 70, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to provide a message to a firm administrator (column

29, lines 38-59, Cheah) reflecting the nature of the detected change made to one

of the contact files associated with a particular contact within one or more of the

plurality of user collections (columns 25-26, lines 52-67 and 1-3, respectively,

Cheah).

Regarding Claims 4 and 40, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration

routine is further adapted to enable the firm administrator to accept or reject the

detected change before the administration routine makes the change to the

common data of the corresponding second contact file associated with the

particular contact within the firm collection (column 22, lines 8-50, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 5,41,and 56, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration

routine includes a rule database that stores rules pertaining to the manner in

which the detected change is to be processed (columns 19-20, lines 62-67 and

1-10, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 6,42,and 57, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the rules are

changeable by the administrator (column 23, lines 30-39, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 7,43,and 58, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to process the detected change to detect a suspected error within the detected change (column 24, lines 24-35, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 8,44,and 59, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to provide a message to the administrator reflecting a description of the suspected error within the detected change (columns 14-15, lines 66-67 and 1-8, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 9,45,and 74, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein each of the user collections includes a change attribute that specifies a manner in which a change made to the firm collection is to be reflected within the user collection (column 30, lines 43-64, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 10,46,and 75, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the change attribute, when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is to be automatically made to the user collection (column 23, lines 40-47, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 11,47,and 76, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the change

attribute, when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is

to be reported to a user having access to the user collection for which the change

attribute exists (column 30, lines 55-60, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 12,48,and 77, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the change

attribute, when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is

to be accepted by the user having access to the user collection for which the

change attribute exists before being made to the user collection for which the

change attribute exists (column 25, lines 52-67, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 13,49,and 78, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein each of the user

collections includes a visibility field that specifies if a change made to a contact

file within the user collection is to be shared with the firm collection (columns 20-

21, lines 55-67 and 1-9, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 14,50,and 79, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein each of the

contact files includes a plurality of contact information fields and wherein the

visibility flag specifies a visibility of one of the contact information fields (Fig.18J;

columns 20-21, lines 55-67 and 1-9, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 15,51,and 80, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein each of the

contact files includes a plurality of contact information fields and wherein the

visibility flag specifies a visibility of an entire contact file (Fig.18J; columns 20-21,

lines 55-67 and 1-9, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 16 and 52, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration

routine is further adapted to process the detected change to detect the addition

of the first contact file for a contact within one of the user collections for which the

second contact file already exists within the firm collection (columns 27-28, lines

53-67 and 1-6, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 17 and 53, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of

Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration

routine is further adapted to process the detected change to detect a user

request for an administrator to make a change to the firm collection (column 26,

lines 37-44, Cheah).

Regarding Claim 69, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah,

disclose the relationship management system wherein each user collection is

accessible by a different user (column 18, lines 28-39, Cheah) and further

comprising a display routine stored on a computer-readable medium, wherein the

display routine is adapted to display the data pertaining to different contacts

stored within each user collection to the user having access to the user collection

(Fig.18C; columns 16-17, lines 62-67 and 1-42, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claim 85, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah,

disclose the system wherein the accept action indicates that the administrator

does not want to monitor the change, the review action indicates that the

administrator wants to monitor the change, the submit action indicates that the

administrator wants to approve the change before performing either the accept

action or the review action, and the follow-up action provides a means of

notifying the different owner of the change before the change routine processes

the response (column 25, lines 52-67 and column 32, lines 33-40, Cheah).

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues, Cheah does not teach the administration routine or the

change routine as recited in the amended claims. In particular, applicant argues

Cheah does not permit the administrator to effectively monitor and manage

changes to the contact information that are made by other users or on other

machines, because the changed data of Cheah is automatically forwarded to the server for distribution or notification without the ability to monitor or manage the changes.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. To begin, Cheah's administrator machine with the corporate administrator application corresponds to the claimed administration routine. Also, since the administrator of the system is responsible for maintaining the contact information as well as supervising and verifying the usage of the contact information (see col.32, lines 33-40, Cheah), then the reference does in fact at the least disclose the administrator both effectively monitoring and managing the changes of the contact information. Simply because the system may allow for an automatic forwarding of distribution or notification does not negate that fact that the administrator still has the ability of monitoring and/or managing the changes that may arise. Further, it is clear that the Cheah reference allows for these changes to be performed by other users as well as on other machines simply because the invention as a whole is based upon a controlled distribution of contact information over a network (see col.2, lines 1-10). Lastly, with respect to the change routine there is not merely one aspect of the Cheah reference which reads upon such feature, however, just to give an example the exchange manager within the exchange system (wherein the exchange manager manages the exchange of particular contact information between registered users, see col.8, lines 40-48) is considered to be an adequate correlation to the change routine.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHELCIE DAYE whose telephone number is (571)272-3891. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4146080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chelcie Daye
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
October 29, 2008

/Apu M Mofiz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161